

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

RONNIE LEE HOUSTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

Defendant.

No. 4:18-CV-00387

(Judge Brann)

(Magistrate Judge Carlson)

**ORDER**

**JANUARY 28, 2019**

On February 15, 2018, Ronnie Lee Houston initiated the above-captioned case against the United States Department of Justice. The parties' cross-motions<sup>1</sup> for summary judgment were referred to Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson, who issued a Report and Recommendation on November 14, 2018.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Houston's objections to that Report and Recommendations were filed on December 4, 2018.<sup>3</sup>

In his Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge Carlson recommended granting Mr. Houston's motion for summary judgment solely to the extent that it sought a certain 10-page letter report summarizing the results of his court-ordered psychiatric evaluation. In his objections, however, Mr. Houston indicated that he already has possession of this document.

---

<sup>1</sup> ECF Nos. 21, 24.

<sup>2</sup> ECF No. 38.

<sup>3</sup> ECF No. 40.

This Court has otherwise conducted a de novo review<sup>4</sup> of the objected-to portions of the Report, and agrees with Magistrate Judge Carlson's analysis and conclusions. Therefore, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. The Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Martin C. Carlson, ECF No. 38, is **ADOPTED IN ITS ENTIRETY**.
2. Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 21, is **DENIED AS MOOT** to the extent it seeks a copy of the psychiatric evaluation report, and is otherwise **DENIED** for the reasons listed in Magistrate Judge Carlson's Report and Recommendation.
3. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 24, is **GRANTED**.
4. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment in favor of Defendant and close this case.

BY THE COURT:

*s/ Matthew W. Brann*

Matthew W. Brann  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>4</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) (“[A]ny party may serve and file written objections to [a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation]. A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made. A judge of the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.”)